Remarks

Claims 1-20 are currently pending. Claims 1, 7, 12, 16, and 17 have been amended while claims 5, 6, 13, and 15 have been cancelled. Applicants assert that all claims are in condition for allowance as set forth more fully below.

103 Rejections

Claims 1-4, 7-14, and 16-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Pearson in view of Eberman. Previously pending claim 5 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Pearson in view of Eberman and further in view of Douglas. Previously pending claim 6 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Pearson in view of Eberman and further in view of Gould. Previously pending claim 15 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Pearson in view of Eberman and further in view of Ditmer. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections to the extent they apply to the claims as listed above.

The independent claims 1, 7, 12, and 16 have been amended to include recitations to a protocol server, systems interface, or the like providing multiple operations to the client application or software for selection by the user to perform legacy transactions. The claims have been further amended to include recitations to the client application or software providing a graphical interface that has a page for the multiple operations provided by the protocol server or interface and has a page for each of the operations. The claims have been further amended to include recitations to the speech recognition application, module, or software having a vocabulary for each page corresponding to one of the operations provided by the protocol server or interface. Thus, the speech recognition has a vocabulary that is specifically tied to each of the operations provided by the protocol server via the pages of the graphical user interface.

None of the cited references disclose such a relationship between the speech recognition module and the systems interface by having the speech recognition module have vocabulary modules tied to pages of a GUI that are based on the operations provided by the systems interface. The Office Action has relied upon the disclosure of Douglas to disclose speech recognition based on a GUI page and has relied upon the disclosure of Gould to disclose speech recognition based on an application that is active.

However, neither Douglas nor Gould discloses that the page that is selected by the user corresponds to an operation provided by a systems interface nor do they disclose that the speech recognition module has vocabulary modules for each page corresponding to each operation provided by the systems interface. The Office Action has conceded that neither Pearson nor Eberman discloses speech recognition that is based on a page of a GUI nor a vocabulary that is corresponds to a GUI page. Accordingly, neither Pearson nor Eberman account for the deficiencies of Douglas and Gould.

The cited references, singly or in combination, fail to disclose all of the recitations of the claims 1, 7, 12, and 16. Therefore, for at least these reasons, these claims are allowable over the cited references. Dependent claims 2-4, 8-11, 14, and 17-20 depend from allowable base claims and are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1-4, 7-12, 14, and 16-20 is in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due beyond the fee for continued examination. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 20, 2005

Jeramie J. Keys
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(404) 849.2093